PALGO JOURNAL OF EDUCATION RESEARCH(PJER)

http://www.palgojournals.org/PJER/Index.htm

REVIEWERS GUIDE

PART A: ***Editorial Office Only***

Title: Cultural Drivers of Effective Census Taking in a Third World Society: A Survey in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

---

RATINGS

Criterion	Rating
Originality	3 (Fair)
Contribution to the Field	3 (Fair)
Technical Quality	3(Poor)
Clarity of Presentation	3 (Fair)
Depth of Research	3 (Fair)

Scale: 1 = Excellent, 2 = Good, 3 = Fair, 4 = Poor

GENERAL COMMENT

This study addresses census challenges in Nigeria—a topic with real policy implications. Your local knowledge of Akwa Ibom State and the extensive literature review are commendable. However, the manuscript has serious methodological weaknesses and a fundamental mismatch between the title (cultural drivers) and findings (logistical barriers). The methodology section lacks essential details, data analysis is minimal, and numerous grammar errors affect readability. Major revisions are needed before this can be considered for publication.

SECTION-BY-SECTION COMMENTS

ABSTRACT

Strengths: Identifies the research problem and mentions theoretical frameworks.

Improvements needed:

- → Expand from current length to 250-300 words with specific findings

- → Include methodology: "This study used [method] with 300 respondents..."
- → Add concrete numbers: Instead of "people felt marginalized," state what percentage and which specific cultural practices
- → **Grammar error:** "census activities was impede" should be "census activities **were impeded**" ←
- No Key word

INTRODUCTION

Strengths: Establishes census importance and provides Nigerian historical context.

Improvements needed:

- → **Grammar error:** "which one important question is, is it possible" should be "**of which one important question is: Is it** possible" ←
- → **Citation format:** "1981.6 Collecting data" should be "1981. **(note 6)** Collecting data" ←
- Break very long paragraphs into shorter, focused ones (maximum 8-10 lines each)
- Add explicit research questions
- State clearly what knowledge gap this study fills
- Standardize citation format throughout (currently mixing inline, footnotes, and sources)

OBJECTIVES

Strengths: Clear and numbered.

Improvements needed:

- Define what you mean by "cultural drivers" (this is never explained)
- Make Objective 3 more academic: "propose evidence-based recommendations" instead of "suggest ways"

STUDY AREA

Strengths: Comprehensive geographic description.

Improvements needed:

- → **Special characters broken:** "40 32â€™" should be "**4° 32'**" ←
- → **Incomplete sentence:** "Eastern Obolo LGA was mapped" ends abruptly ←
- Reduce excessive geographic/climate detail unless directly relevant to census challenges
- Move sampling information ("100 per senatorial district") to Methodology section

---

LITERATURE REVIEW

Strengths: Extensive historical coverage with multiple sources.

Improvements needed:

- Reorganize thematically instead of chronologically: (1) Historical census challenges, (2) Political economy of numbers, (3) Technical barriers, (4) Cultural factors
- Add critical analysis—don't just summarize sources
- → **Grammar:** "census that would be accepted took place only in 1992" should be "The next census to gain widespread acceptance was conducted in 1992" ←
- End with clear statement of research gap

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Strengths: Three theories presented with applications.

Improvements needed:

- → **Spacing error:** "oppression i s driven" should be "oppression **is** driven" ←
- → **Spacing error:** "kn own as" should be "**known** as" ←
- Explain WHY you chose these three specific theories
- Show how they work together (not just separately)
- Strengthen connection between theories and your actual data analysis

---

METHODOLOGY ⚠ CRITICAL SECTION

Major Problems: This is the weakest section and requires complete rewriting.

What's missing (MUST ADD):

- → **Research design:** State clearly whether quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods
- → **Sampling rationale:** WHY these specific LGAs and villages? What criteria did you use?
- → **Sample size justification:** Why 300? Why 50 per village? Is this statistically adequate?
- → **Data collection instruments:** What questionnaire did you use? Include it in an appendix or describe all questions
- → **Interview protocol:** How many interviews? What questions? Was there an interview guide?
- → **Data collection procedure:** Who collected data? When? Training received?
- → **Data analysis methods:** What software? Statistical tests used? How were interviews analyzed?
- → **Ethical approval:** Which institution? Consent procedures?
- → **Study limitations:** Every study has limitations

Current error:

- → "one village from one local government area" should be "one village from **each** local government area" ←

RESULTS ⚠ CRITICAL SECTION

Major Problems:

- Tables 8 & 9 show only 9 people counted in 2006 (riverine) and 19 people (land). This seems impossibly low for a state with millions. Do you mean 9 of your 300 respondents were personally counted? **Please clarify what these numbers represent!**
- **Minimal interview data:** Only 3 brief quotes. Need more. How many people were interviewed total?
- **No analysis:** You present raw numbers without interpretation
- **Missing connection:** Results don't address your stated objective to identify "cultural drivers"
- **Theory ignored:** No connection to your three theoretical frameworks

Improvements needed:

- Tables 2-4 (official census data) should move to Background section—they're not your findings
- Add statistical analysis (significance tests, correlations)
- Present more interview themes with supporting quotes
- Actually analyze what the data means
- Create clear links to research objectives

DISCUSSION

Major Problem: Only 4 bullet points—this is not a discussion section.

A proper discussion must:

- Interpret findings (what do they mean?)
- Compare with literature you reviewed
- Apply your three theories to explain patterns
- Address unexpected findings
- Discuss policy/practice implications
- Acknowledge limitations
- Suggest future research

Currently your "discussion" just restates findings without any interpretation.

CRITICAL ISSUE: TITLE VS. FINDINGS MISMATCH

Your title promises to identify "**cultural drivers**" but your findings show:

- Fear of water crossing (logistical barrier)
- Bad roads (infrastructure barrier)
- Inaccessible terrain (geographic barrier)

Where are the cultural drivers? Examples of cultural drivers would be:

- Religious beliefs about being counted
- Traditional taboos against enumeration
- Gender norms restricting women's participation
- Language barriers
- Distrust of government based on cultural history

You must either:

1. Add data on actual cultural barriers, OR
2. Change your title to match what you found: "Logistical Barriers to Effective Census Taking in Akwa Ibom State"

CONCLUSIONS

Improvements needed:

- → **Grammar:** "population count serve" should be "population count**s** serve" ←
- → **Grammar:** "fair as serve" should be "fair **and** serve" ←
- Summarize YOUR specific findings (not general statements)
- Address the disconnect between stated focus and actual findings

---

RECOMMENDATIONS

Strengths: Practical suggestions.

Improvements needed:

- Base recommendations on YOUR data, not general knowledge
- Prioritize (which are most urgent?)
- Add implementation details (who, how, resources needed)
- → **Clarification:** "should continue to be removed"—were they already removed? If so, say "**should remain removed**" ←

REFERENCES

Major Problems:

- Multiple citation styles mixed together
- Incomplete entries (missing pages, DOIs, URLs)
- Not alphabetized properly
- Web sources lack proper URLs and dates

Many references never appear in the text: Including works by:

- Brown (1991)
- Butler (2013)
- Chinsman (1995)
- Diamond (1998)
- Gurr (1970)
- Kuczynski (1948)
- Pinker (2002)
- And many others

Recommendation: The authors need to either:

- Remove uncited references from the reference list, OR
- Add proper in-text citations for all listed references
- Standardize the citation format throughout the document

Examples needing correction:

→ "Butler, R.A. (2013). Mongabay.com Retrieved from current June 29" needs complete URL and proper date format ←

→ "Demographic and Health Survey‖ www.measuredhs.com, accessed (2006)" needs full bibliographic information ←

Fix: Choose ONE citation style (recommend APA 7th edition) and apply consistently throughout.

DECISION

MAJOR REVISION REQUIRED

What this means: The study addresses an important topic, but substantial work is needed before it can be published. The problems are not with your topic but with how you've conducted and presented the research.

Most important fixes (MUST DO):

1. **Rewrite Methodology completely** with all missing details
2. **Resolve title/findings mismatch** (cultural vs. logistical barriers)
3. **Expand Results with actual analysis** and more interview data
4. **Write proper Discussion section** (not just bullet points)
5. **Explain the confusing numbers** in Tables 8 & 9
6. **Standardize all references** to one citation style
7. **Fix all grammar errors**

FINAL COMMENTS

You've chosen an important research topic with real policy implications for Nigeria. The extensive literature review shows you understand the historical context. However, the execution needs significant strengthening.

The core issue is that you've promised to identify "cultural drivers" but your data shows logistical problems (roads, water access). This needs resolution. Either find and present the cultural barriers in your data, or acknowledge that you discovered logistical—not cultural—barriers and adjust your framing accordingly.

The methodology section must be completely rewritten with sufficient detail that another researcher could replicate your study. Currently, critical information is missing.

With substantial revision addressing these concerns, this could become a useful contribution to understanding census challenges in Nigeria. The topic deserves a rigorous study—invest the time to strengthen your research design and analysis.

Reviewer Recommendation: Major Revisions Required

Review Date: October 3, 2025